

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 17 and 27-28 have been amended. The applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated July 6, 2000.

**Claim Objections:**

Claims 1, 6, 17, 27 and 28 stand objected to due to certain informalities, as set forth in items 3-7, pages 2 and 3 of the outstanding Action.

Claims 1, 6, 17, 27 and 28 are amended, as attached herewith, to overcome such informalities. Accordingly, withdrawal of such objection is respectfully submitted.

**As To The Merits:**

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner sets forth the following rejections:

claims 1-27, 31, 32, 36 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Watanabe (U.S. Patent No. 5,717,776) in view of Sukegawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,165); and

claims 28-30, 33, 34 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 based on Watanabe in view of Sukegawa et al. and Bradly et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,071).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Although, the Examiner admits that Watanabe fails to disclose "a display unit for displaying a guidance for the procedure for the identification document transaction,"<sup>1</sup> "a sign input unit,"<sup>2</sup> "a control section for transmitting the data inputted by each of the input units to the center using the communication unit"<sup>3</sup> and "orchestrating the center so as to determine whether the applied for identification document is to be issued or not based on the identification data,"<sup>4</sup> the Examiner relies on the secondary reference of Sukegawa for teaches these deficiencies of Watanabe.

The secondary reference of Sukegawa discloses an automatic resident card dispensing system which includes a resident record data base, a resident card dispensation processing section, a display section, an input section and a user identification processing section.

However, Sukegawa fails to disclose a sign input unit. That is, since Sukegawa relates to an apparatus that issues a resident card, and not a passport, an applicant's signature is not required.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see, lines 19-20, page 4 of the outstanding Action.

<sup>2</sup> Please see, line 4, page 5 of the outstanding Action.

<sup>3</sup> Please see lines 12-13, page 5 of the outstanding Action.

<sup>4</sup> Please see lines 15-17, page 5 of the outstanding Action.

**AMENDMENT**

**SERIAL NO.: 09/199,566**

Thus, for at least these reasons, it is respectfully asserted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest recitations of claims 1-37, and request that the Examiner allow these claims, along with the entire application, to issue. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

**AMENDMENT**

**SERIAL NO.: 09/199,566**

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

**ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,  
McLELAND & NAUGHTON**



Thomas E. Brown  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 44,450

Atty. Docket No. **A981391**  
Suite 1000  
1725 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 659-2930  
TEB/jnj

Enclosures:

H:\FLOATERS\TEB\eb\981391\Amendment.frm